## Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2009

**Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:**

See Overview description in Indicator 1.

---

**Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments**

---

**Indicator 3:** Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who demonstrate improved:

- A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);
- B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication); and
- C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A) and 1442)

---

**Measurement:**

Outcomes:

A.  Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);

B.  Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication); and

C.  Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

Progress categories for A, B and C:

- a. Percent of infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning = [(# of infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning) divided by (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100.

- b. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100.

- c. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it = [(# of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it) divided by (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100.

- d. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100.

- e. Percent of infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100.

**Summary Statements for Each of the Three Outcomes (use for FFY 2008-2009 reporting):**

**Summary Statement 1:** Of those infants and toddlers who entered or exited early intervention below age expectations in each Outcome, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program.

---

> **Measurement for Summary Statement 1:**
>
> Percent = # of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (c) plus # of infants and toddlers reported in category (d) divided by [# of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (a) plus # of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (b) plus # of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (c) plus # of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (d)] times 100.
>
> **Summary Statement 2:** The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in each Outcome by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program.
>
> **Measurement for Summary Statement 2:** Percent = # of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (d) plus [# of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (e) divided by the total # of infants and toddlers reported in progress categories (a) + (b) + (c) + (d) + (e)] times 100.

Arizona adopted the Early Childhood Outcomes Center's (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary Form and renamed it the Child Indicator Summary Form (CISF). Minor adaptations were made to the form to capture necessary demographic information, combine data tables, and change the ratings from numbers to letters so children would not be rated a high or low number. Beginning June 15, 2006, Child Indicator Summary Entry Forms were completed for infants and toddlers who were (i) referred at age 2.6 years or younger, (ii) eligible for AzEIP, and (iii) interested in early intervention. On December 15, 2006, programs began completing exit forms. Exit data are collected for children who exit early intervention after at least six months in early intervention, regardless of the exit reason. The exit rating is determined no earlier than 90 days prior to the child's exit from early intervention.

The child's IFSP team, which includes the family, uses the CISF to summarize data from a variety of sources, including parent report, observation, a broad spectrum tool, other evaluation results, and available records. Arizona has approved certain broad spectrum tools that (i) ensure all areas of development are assessed, and have been cross-walked by the ECO Center. Programs may choose any tool on the following list:

- The Ounce Scale;
- Battelle Developmental Inventory, Second Edition;
- Bayley Scales of Infant Development, Third Edition;
- Brigance Diagnostic Inventory of Early Development, Second Edition;
- Carolina Curriculum for Infants and Toddlers with Special Needs, Third Edition;
- Developmental Assessment of Young Children;
- Early Learning Accomplishment Profile;
- Hawaii Early Learning Profile;
- Infant -Toddler Developmental Assessment Record with Provence Birth-to-Three Developmental Profile;
- Michigan Early Intervention Developmental Profile, Revised, Vol. 1 and 2; and
- The Oregon Project for Visually Impaired and Blind Preschool Children Skills Inventory, Sixth Edition.

**Target Data and Actual Target Data for FFY 2009:**

| Summary Statements | Target Data FFY 2009 (% of children) | Actual Target Data FFY 2009 (% of children) |
|---|---|---|
| **Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)** | | |
| 1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they exited the program. | 62% | 65% |
| 2. The percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they exited the program. | 57% | 64% |

| Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy) | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1.  Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they exited the program. | 71% | 73% |
| 2. The percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they exited the program. | 49% | 57% |
| Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs | | |
| 1.  Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they exited the program. | 71% | 75% |
| 2. The percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they exited the program. | 52% | 58% |

## Progress Data for Part C Children FFY 2009

| A.  Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships): | Number of children | % of children |
|---|---|---|
| a.  Percent of infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning. | 30 | 4% |
| b.  Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers. | 155 | 19% |
| c.  Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach. | 114 | 14% |
| d.  Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers. | 230 | 28% |
| e.   Percent of infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers. | 296 | 36% |
| **Total** | 825 | 100% |
| B.  Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication): | Number of children | % of children |
| a.  Percent of infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning. | 20 | 2% |
| b.  Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers. | 155 | 19% |
| c.  Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach. | 183 | 22% |
| d.  Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers. | 300 | 36% |
| e.   Percent of infants and toddlers who maintained | 167 | 20% |

| | Number of children | % of children |
|---|---|---|
| functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers. | | |
| **Total** | 825 | 100% |
| **C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs:** | **Number of children** | **% of children** |
| a. Percent of infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning. | 24 | 3% |
| b. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers. | 139 | 17% |
| c. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach. | 187 | 23% |
| d. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers. | 305 | 37% |
| e. Percent of infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers. | 170 | 21% |
| **Total** | 825 | 100% |

**Discussion of Data:** Arizona met its target for FFY 2009. Data in all summary statements improved from FFY 2008.

Quality of Services: Despite Arizona's narrow eligibility, Arizona's data demonstrate that between 65-75 percent of the children in the program substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned three or exited the program. Between 56-64 percent of the children were functioning within age expectations by the age of three years or at the time of exit.

DES/AzEIP reviewed the child outcome data by program. For all but one program, data generally followed the State's pattern for the child outcomes. That program, which serves the largest number of children in early intervention, had data ranging from 7 to 22 percentage points below the State's actual data. DES/AzEIP has been provided technical assistance to address both data and program quality with this program. For the majority of the remainder of the State early intervention programs, the Team-Based Model has been implemented. Although child outcome data is still new, it is hypothesized that this model is improving child outcomes for children and families in the State.

Quality of Data: Due to database identification errors during the conversion to new contracts during FFY 2009, the number of children for whom data were available is underrepresented. Data programmers are in the process of correcting the matching of children entering and exiting to correct the error.

DES/ADES/AzEIP compared a sample of paper forms from different regions with database entries to ensure accuracy of the data. DES/AzEIP also identified "impossible" errors in the data where additional technical assistance was then provided to programs by the AzEIP TAMS and data corrections made. DES/AzEIP identified one program with inconsistent completion of the forms during the reporting period. TAMS follow-up was made and review of forms undertaken.

Representativeness of Data:

| Ethnicity | 618 Data | AZ Child Outcome Data | +/- |
|---|---|---|---|
| American Indian | 6% | 6% | |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | 2% | 2% | |
| Black or African American | 5% | 3% | -2 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 37% | 28% | -9 |
| White | 50% | 61% | +11 |

| Gender | 618 Data | AZ Child Outcome Data | |
|--------|----------|----------------------|--|
| Female | 35% | 35% | |
| Male | 65% | 65% | |

The State's child outcome data for ethnicity are generally representative of the ethnicity of the children served in the program per the State's 618 data, except there is a 10 and 11 point difference for Hispanic and White, respectively. DES/AzEIP reviewed the ethnicities of the children who could not be entered due to one program's failure to consistently complete the forms. The ethnicity percentages would not change if these children had been included in the data. One reason for the difference may be connected to the fact that 47 percent of the children who exited early intervention due to "attempts to contact unsuccessful" were Hispanic. (See AzEIP 618 data.) Because programs complete the CISF with the family, if the early intervention team had no contact for an extended period of time, they do not complete exit forms because recent developmental information is not available. Although 618 data are for a different date range, this difference has been consistent for the last 3 reporting periods.

Additional activities will be undertaken to determine if there is a means to increase representation for the CISF for children who are Hispanic.

The State's percentage of child outcome data by gender is close in representation to the gender of children served by the program. As to geographic representation, child outcome data were received from 14 of the 15 counties in Arizona. The one county without representation, La Paz, did not have any children exiting the program who were in early intervention for at least 6 months.

Integrated Monitoring Activities Data: DES/AzEIP reviewed program data from the remainder of Cycle 1 programs monitored for the child outcome related requirements during FFY 2009. Data reflect 100 percent performance on the related items. The related requirements for Indicator 3 are included in the new AzEIP Program Self-Reports, and this data will be reported in FFY 2010.

**Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed <u>and</u> Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2009:**

Progress was made in all areas of the child outcomes from FFY 2008 data. To improve the quality of the data, a YouTube video was created on the topic of Child Indicators (Child Outcomes) with 110 viewers to date. One area the video addressed was a specific data error made by rating teams. Focused, onsite TA was also provided by the AzEIP TAMS to programs around the State that were identified through the automated database with data errors. The percentage of data errors decreased from FFY 2008 to FFY 2009.

Additional training and technical assistance to improve program services, the following was completed in an effort to affect child outcomes:

- YouTube video overviews created by the AzEIP Technical Assistance and Monitoring Specialists (TAMS) on the following topics: (1) Functional Outcomes – 118 viewers to date; (2) the AzEIP Team-Based Model – 124 viewers to date; and (3) Service Coordination functions – 144 viewers to date.
- Lunch and Learn statewide conference calls by Dathan Rush and M'Lisa Sheldon on participation based practices.
- In-person and telephonic trainings and TA for the new AzEIP Team-Based Model contracts covering nine counties and completing the team-based model implementation for DES/AzEIP contractors. The TA and trainings also included the local programs with the Arizona State Schools for the Deaf and the Blind (ASDB) and the DES/Division of Developmental Disabilities (DDD) to ensure continuity of information across the AzEIP system.
- Continued support for AzEIP Team-Based Model Contractors through review of quarterly data with the programs.

| Improvement Activities | Timelines | Status |
|---|---|---|
| DES/AzEIP works closely with AzEIP service-providing agencies to ensure that the necessary data elements needed for the new database are entered into the current data systems. The programs are encouraged to monitor their data system on at least a monthly basis, to ensure accurate and timely data collection. | August 2007 - 2010 | DES/AzEIP's focus and results during FFY 2009 supported DES/AzEIP contractors and data processes. FFY 2010 focus is to support DDD and ASDB in data editing and validation processes. |
| DES/AzEIP is developing a data-handling plan, which includes a regular review (at least bi-annually) of the child indicator data. Through this review, DES/AzEIP will (i) coordinate with the TAMS to provide technical assistance with programs; and (ii) share data with programs for program improvement. | October 2007 – 2010 | DES/AzEIP communicated with representatives from DAC and NECTAC for TA on its data handling plan. DAC will return in May 2011 to help evaluate implementation of the integrated monitoring system, and data routines and validations processes. |
| Provide targeted and general technical assistance through regional meetings, on-site and phone meetings with TAMS and/or DES/AzEIP staff, written guidance/clarification and other strategies. Technical assistance will address:<br><br>• policies and procedures;<br>• IDEA requirements, including timelines; and<br>• child outcomes and completion of the Child Indicator Summary Form. | January 2008 and ongoing | Ten Policies and Professionalism trainings were held throughout the State. Focused TA and training were provided in responses to identified areas of need from AzEIP's integrated monitoring activities. New team-based model contracts were awarded in FY 2009 and direct TA and training provided to those contractors related to improving outcomes for children and families through the team-based model. Both ASDB and DDD local programs were invited to these trainings. For current TBM contractors, meetings (both telephonic and in-person) were held at least quarterly. |
| Provide technical assistance and training to programs during targeted regional meetings regarding improving child outcomes through program improvement activities. | July 2008 and ongoing | See Status directly above. |
| DES/AzEIP will review a random sample of CISFs and compare with the database to reduce errors. | Quarterly beginning June 2008 and ongoing | Completed by comparing a sample of paper forms from different regions with database entries to ensure accuracy. |
| DES/AzEIP to review policies and procedures and circulate for public comment proposed changes to expand description of purpose and process for child and family outcomes. | July 2009 – July 2010 | DES/AzEIP policies were issued for public comment in spring 2009 and subsequently approved by OSEP. Chapter 2, General Supervision describes the indicators in the context of |

| Improvement Activities | Timelines | Status |
|---|---|---|
| | | the SPP and APR. Chapter 4, Early Intervention Services discusses the purpose and process for child outcomes in the context of the how and when early intervention supports the child and family. |

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2010**

| Improvement Activity | Timeline | Resources |
|---|---|---|
| DES/AzEIP works closely with AzEIP service-providing agencies to ensure that the necessary data elements needed for the new database are entered into the current data systems. The programs are encouraged to monitor their data system on at least a monthly basis, to ensure accurate and timely data collection. | **Revise:** August 2007 – 2010 **To:** August 2007 and ongoing **Justification:** Align with extension of SPP | DES/AzEIP staff, Agency Partners, TAMS |
| DES/AzEIP is developing a data-handling plan, which includes a regular review (at least bi-annually) of the child indicator data. Through this review, DES/AzEIP will: (i) coordinate with the TAMS to provide technical assistance with programs; and (ii) share data with programs for program improvement. | **Revise:** October 2007 – 2010 **To:** October 2007 and ongoing **Justification:** Align with extension of SPP | DES/AzEIP Staff, Agency Partners, TAMS |
| **Delete:** Provide technical assistance and training to programs during targeted regional meetings regarding improving child outcomes through program improvement activities.  **Justification:** Duplicative of another improvement activity to provide targeted and general technical assistance to programs. | **July 2008 and ongoing** | |